



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Admistrative Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,381	04/13/2006	Arne Eitzold	GOS-4	8459
20311	7590	04/23/2008		
LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP 475 PARK AVENUE SOUTH 15TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10016			EXAMINER	
			HOEY, ALISSA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3765	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/23/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/595,381	Applicant(s) ETZOLD ET AL.
	Examiner Alissa L. Hoey	Art Unit 3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 20-32 and 34-37 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 20-32 and 34-37 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 January 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to amendment received on 01/09/08. Claims 20-32 and 35-37 are amended and claim 33 is cancelled. Amendments were also made to the drawings and the specification to overcome rejection/objections. The drawings and specification amendments have been entered. Claims 20-32 and 34-37 are examined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 20 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Munjone (US 5,598,586).

In regard to claim 20, Munjone teaches sports clothing capable of being worn for team sports that use a ball, especially soccer, rugby, handball or basketball, said sports clothing comprising an upper part (upper part of 10) and a lower part (lower part of 10), said upper part and lower part being designed in one piece when used as intended (figures 1-5), characterized by overshoes (12) arranged over the lower part (18).

In regard to claim 34, Munjone teaches the sports clothing as claimed in claim 20, characterized in that the overshoes (12) are longer than the lower part (18).

In regard to claim 35, Munjone teaches the sports clothing as claimed in claim 20, characterized in that upper part (upper part of 10) and/or lower part (lower part of 10) and overshorts (12) are provided with at least one ventilation opening (26).

In regard to claim 36, Munjone teaches the lower part being made of highly elastic material (18, inner short is made of Lycra).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 20, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweeney (US WO 0032067) in view of Pedrick (US 6,665,882).

In regard to claim 20, Sweeney teaches sports clothing that is capable of being worn for team sports that use a ball, especially soccer, rugby, handball or basketball. The clothing comprising an upper part (2) and a lower part (9), said upper part (2) and lower part (9) being designed in one piece when used as intended.

However, Sweeney fails to teach overshorts arranged over the lower part and the lower part being made of elastic material and is cut such that it fits tightly around the wearer's thighs.

Pedrick teaches a pair of board shorts that have overshorts arranged over a lower short portion (see figures 2-4). Further, Pedrick teaches garment the inner shorts/lower shorts being made of neoprene which is an elastic material that fits tightly

around the wearer's thighs (see inner short (20) made out of neoprene (column 4, lines 35-42).

In regard to claims 25, 26 and 27, Sweeney teaches the upper part (2) and lower part (9) being connected to one another by a plurality of different fasteners, including hook and loop fasteners (figure 3).

However, Sweeney fails to specifically teach zipper fasteners and lace fasteners, it would have been obvious to have provided the lower and upper parts connected by zipper, hook and loop or lace fasteners, because as long as the upper and lower parts are releasably connected together by fasteners, the fasteners can be chosen from any interchangeable or equivalent fasteners known in the apparel arts.

It would have been obvious to have provided the unitary garment of Sweeney with the double layer short portion of Pedrick, since the unitary garment of Sweeney provided with overshorts and inner shorts would provide for additional warmth to the user when wearing the garment.

6. Claims 20-24 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Munjone (US 5,598,586).

In regard to claim 20, Rosenberg teaches sports clothing capable of being worn for team sports that use a ball, especially soccer, rugby, handball or basketball, said sports clothing comprising an upper part (1) and a lower part (3), said upper part (1) and lower part (3) being designed in one piece when used as intended, characterized by overshoorts (2) arranged over the lower part (3).

However, Rosenberg fails to teach the lower part being made of elastic material and is cut such that it fits tightly around the wearer's thighs.

Munjone teaches an athletic shorts garment having inner shorts and overshoorts. The inner shorts are made of Lycra and the overshoorts are made of nylon. Lycra and nylon are both elastic material that would fit tightly around the wearer's thighs (figures 3-5, column 4, lines 42-53 and column 5, lines 35-45).

In regard to claim 21, Rosenberg teaches the sports clothing as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the overshoorts (2) are sewn onto the lower part (3) at the site where upper part (1) and lower part (3) are sewn together (21).

In regard to claim 22, Rosenberg teaches the sports clothing as claimed in claim 21, characterized in that upper part (1) and lower part (3) are sewn together (21).

In regard to claim 23, Rosenberg teaches the sports clothing as claimed in claim 22, characterized in that upper part (1), lower part (3) and overshoorts (2) are connected to one another by a single seam (21)

In regard to claim 24, Rosenberg teaches the sports clothing as claimed in claim 22, characterized in that the seam (21) connecting upper part (1) and lower part (3) runs all the way round the hip region (figures 1 and 2).

In regard to claim 29, Rosenberg teaches the upper part having button and buttonhole fastener (8, 9) for opening the neck passage (3). However, Rosenberg fails to teach that the upper part has a zipper fastener, a hook and loop fastener or a lace fastener for the neck passage.

In regard to claim 29, it would have been obvious to have provided the fasteners to be zipper fasteners, hook and loop fasteners, lace fasteners, or button and buttonhole fasteners, because as long as the neck allows for a releasable opening the type of fasteners can be chosen from any equivalent and interchangeable fastener in the apparel arts.

In regard to claim 30, Rosenberg teaches the one fastener runs in the shoulder region (figure 1).

In regard to claim 31, Rosenberg teaches two fasteners extending outward from the neck passage across the shoulder region (figure 1).

It would have been obvious to have provided the unitary athletic garment of Rosenberg with the elastic material of Munjone, because the unitary athletic garment of Rosenberg provided with elastic inner shorts and over shorts would provide for an athletic garment that conforms to a user's body so as not to get caught on any athletic equipment or other athletes affecting performance.

7. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg and Munjone in view of Hochman (US 5,418,978).

Rosenberg and Munjone teach a unitary garment as described above in claim 20. However, Rosenberg and Munjone fail to teach the unitary garment having an elastic band arranged in the connecting area between an upper part and a lower part.

In regard to claim 28, Hochman teaches a unitary garment with an elastic band arranged in the connecting area between an upper part and a lower part (figures 1 and 2, identifiers 18, 19).

It would have been obvious to have provided the unitary garment of Rosenberg and Munjone with the elastic band arranged in the connecting area of Hochman, since the unitary garment of Rosenberg and Munjone provided with an elastic band arranged in the connecting area would provide a unitary garment that provides a snug but adjustable fit at the waist for greater comfort and fit.

8. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg and Munjone in view of Green (US 5,946,726).

Rosenberg and Munjone teach a unitary garment as described above in claim 20. However, Rosenberg and Munjone fail to teach an elastic band arranged in the neck region.

Green teaches an athletic garment having an elastic band arranged in the neck region (24).

It would have been obvious to have provided the athletic unitary garment of Rosenberg and Munjone and with the elastic band in the neck region of Green, since the athletic unitary garment of Rosenberg and Munjone provided with an elastic band in

the neck region would increase tension in the neck area to better conform to the athlete's body.

9. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg and Munjone in view of Diamond (US 2,141,239).

Rosenberg and Munjone teach a unitary garment as described above in claim 20. However, Rosenberg and Munjone fail to teach the seam between the upper and lower portion being formed from an elastic thread.

Diamond teaches an elastic seam for garments (page 1, column 1, lines 4-10).

It would have been obvious to have provided the unitary garment of Rosenberg and Munjone with the elastic seam of Diamond, since the unitary garment of Rosenberg and Munjone provided with an elastic seam would provide for a garment having a seam connecting the upper and lower portion allowing for greater flexibility and movement of the user's body without jeopardizing seam strain and possible rupture.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 01/09/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Munjone fails to teach the lower part fitting tightly around the user's thighs.

Examiner disagrees, since Munjone teaches the lower part (18) being made out of Lycra, which is an elastic material that conforms to the user's body including the thighs (see Munjone column 5, lines 35-47).

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alissa L. Hoey whose telephone number is (571) 272-4985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30)Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Welch can be reached on (571) 272-4996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ALH

/Alissa L. Hoey/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3765